

THE
Primitive Fathers
NO
PROTESTANTS:
OR, A
VINDICATION
OF
Quibus Testium
From the CAVILS of the
ANSWERER.

Published with Allowance.

L O N D O N,

Printed by *Henry Hills*, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, for His Household and Chappel; And are sold at his Printing-house on the *Ditch-side* in *Black-Fryers*. 1687.

11

Primitive Fathers

PROTESTANTS

UNION

General

ANSWER

to the

by the

The *Primitive Fathers* no *Protestants*, or
a Vindication of *Nubes Testium* from
the Cavils of the *Answerer*.

FOR almost Three years I have been travelling over a fair and large Field of Controversie, Discourfing of feveral moft material Points, with Men of Senfe, of Honor and Judgment. And now at laft I know not what Controverfial Trifler has thruft himfelf into the Company, buftling and making a noife, puff'd up with Contempt and Scorn, his Mouth full of Great Volumes, *The Code of the Universal Church*, *The Code of the Laws of the Church* : but fo empty of every thing, befides *Self-conceit* and *Noife*, that he feems to have had the Misfortune of Sir *William Davenant's* Profound Scholar, who, when he was *Young*, broke his Head, with taking Great Books from *High Shelves*, and knew nothing more of them afterwards, befides their *Weight* and their *Names*. This feems to be the Cafe of our *New Man*, who is fo earneftly taken up with his *Great Self* and his *Books*, that *Plain Senfe* and *Good Reasoning* feem to be beneath his Confideration. He has an admirable Knack of making the *Fathers*. fpeak what Senfe he pleafes; but 'tis by the Modern Art of the *Speaking Head*, not without a Fraud at the bottom. Then for railing of *Shadows*, and fiercely Combating them; for blowing up Molehills into Mountains, and as artificially levelling them again, he is not to be match'd. But above all, for giving the Go-by to any

A 2

thing

thing of Difficulty, and silyly retreating, when a Pressing Argument is in sight, he is the best of the Kind. Such an Adversary as this is to be my Task at present ; I'll lightly run over every Point he proposes, tho' I think it more than his Cavilling deserves.

And here first he advances an Accusation against the Author of the *Papist Misrepresented* and of this *Collection*, with a great deal of Warmth, Swaggering and Domineering, as if he had him already under foot, and with the Triumph of a *Popish Plot*, condemns him without being heard. But why such Spleen against him ? What has he done ? As many as have perus'd those Books, know, that nothing has ever appear'd abroad of Controversie, that could possibly give less offence to the Adverse Party than They ; there being nothing of Abuse or Reproach offer'd to their *Persons* or *Church*, no Revilings or Jeers, nor any thing to displease, besides the *Method*, the Force of Argument and Reason, and General Reception they found every where. What reason then of so much Spleen and Malice against his *Person*, who had been thus Inoffensive in his Writings, to all sorts of Adversaries ? But I need not examine far : I remember the *Devil* never rag'd more in the *Child* in the *Gospel*, than when he was commanded *out* of him. These Books are like so many Commands of *Go out*, to the Devils of *Schism* and *Error*, with which our deluded Countrymen are possess'd ; and hence such as are interested in the Delusion, cannot but rage and storm ; and what Malice they cannot vent upon the *Books*, shall be certainly discharg'd upon the *Author*. But what a poor and unmanly sort of Revenge this is, is apparent to every Eye : 'tis a plain Confession at least, of the *Weakness* of their Attempt, whilst they are so distrustful of their own *Answers*, as not to dare to relie on them for the gaining the Cause, but they must first win the Reader by undervaluing
their

their Adversary, and making him Contemptible in a Preface. This is the Method our New Friend has gone in his Answer to *Nubes Testium*: and 'tis likely he has said enough to gain upon such Readers, as have had only such a Portion of Wit, as to understand just enough to be deceiv'd: but with others, I am confident, he has only betray'd the weakness of his own Cause, and shewn a Good Will in saying nothing to the Purpose.

For what signifies all the News he brings, that the greatest part of the Testimonies in that *Collection*, are in *F. Natalis Alexandre's* History? Did not I declare very plainly in the *Papist Misrepresented, &c. Ch. 37.* that I could produce a great number of *Testimonies* of the *Primitive Fathers*, teaching and maintaining those very Points, which by *Protestants* are condemn'd of *Novelty*? And did not I again *Chap. 13.* in shewing the Antiquity of *Praying for the Dead* and the *Belief of Purgatory*, refer to many *Ancient Fathers*, which I there declar'd were to be seen at large in the Learned *Natalis Alexandre*? So that the wonderful Discovery he has made, is, that he has found a Great Part of the Testimonies in that History; in which I had before told the World, they were to be found. Very Great and Good! And Wonderful News! Such Quick and Penetrating Wits certainly are not to be met with every day. And by what I see now, I am almost persuaded, that upon other Six Months considering on the Point, this Great Man might have guess'd something of the Matter, tho' I had given him no hint at all. For 'tis very probable, that upon such a perusal of this *Collection* of Testimonies, he might have at last conjectur'd, that most of the same *Testimonies* might be found in such Authors, as had formerly Publish'd such *Collections*. That 'tis likely they might be seen in *Baronius*, in *Bellarmino*, in *Garetius*, in *Cassius*, in *Perrov*, in the *Manual of Controversie*; and upon such

Such a Thought as this, what a Glorious and well-fraught *Margin* might he have set out, closely lin'd on every side, not only with *Natalis*, but with all the rest of these *Great Names*, with their *Books, Chapters, and Pages*. How this would have forc'd Admiration from those *Great Contemplatists*, who content themselves with the *Prospect* of a *Margin*, instead of Reading the Context ! They could not have pass'd him by, without the Complement of, *Certainly this Man must be a very Pretty Scholar*. And then what a monstrous Plagiarism had he made of the *Compiler*, by shewing, that he had said nothing but what had been publish'd by Fifty Authors before ?

For my part, my only Concern was, to let our Countrymen see, how favorably the *Ancient Fathers* speak of such Points, which they are so often told here from the Pulpit, are nothing but meer *Inventions, Novelty, and Additions* to the *Faith* of the *Primitive Church* ; and knowing that such *Testimonies* had been often produc'd by many and eminent Authors, but scatter'd in *large Volumes*, and chiefly in *Latin* too ; so that they were not to be seen, but with difficulty and Expence ; I thought it would not be an unseasonable Work, to reduce them into a little Room, and into such a Method, that it might be in the power of every ordinary Reader, to make a Judgment of what they had so often heard, but never seen any thing. So that here I never thought of producing a *New Set of Testimonies*, such as had been never heard of before ; but judg'd it would be sufficient, to make use of their Works, who had before labor'd in this Province : and that if I gather'd into a *Few Sheets* the *Choice* of those great numbers of Testimonies, which are spread through Twenty Tomes of *F. Natalis*, with the Addition of some others, and rendring them into *English* too, it would not be unworthy of the Name of a *Collection* ; but whether I was to pass for a *Publisher* or *Compiler*,

Compiler, was indifferent to me. And this the *Answerer* might have been sensible of, if his Conscience had but given him leave; for whilst I expressly set down the *Names* of the *Authors*, in which all those *Testimonies* of the *Appendix* to the *Collection* are to be seen at large, he might very well have conjectur'd, that I could as easily have done the like to the *Collection*, had it been Publish'd in a Time, wherein the Name of the *Author* there us'd, had not been obnoxious to Exceptions with some. For to speak plainly my Mind, I am so far from being offended in being thought a *Compiler*, that I should have thought my self unwise, if I had done more than *Compil'd*: For what a Wise Attempt had I made, if I had gone about to read over an hundred Volumes of the Fathers, which, considering my Circumstances, I could not have finish'd in Twenty Years, for the doing of that, which was not a Twelve-months Work, by consulting those, who had already taken the pains to my hand.

I cannot therefore but thank the *Answerer* for giving this notice, and letting the World know, that I had more Consideration, than to take so much unnecessary pains, for the doing that, which had been so fully done already. Tho' I am of opinion, this is News to none but Unthinking Men, since all Men of Sense must needs judge so before. And tho' I mention'd no Name of the *Author* I us'd, for the Reason above; yet for so doing, I had Authority enough, since in the *Answerer's* opinion, even *F. Alexandre* himself was only a *Compiler*, and yet he never tells one word of the *Author* he uses in Collecting those *Testimonies*. 'Twas enough for my Design, that this Father was of *Good Repute* as to these *Authorities*, and as to every thing else, at the time when I made this *Collection*; and that I had the satisfaction to find him so, by comparing him with the Works of the Fathers, at least as to so great a Part, that I

had

had no reason to question him as to the rest. And tho' the *Answerer* so often triumphs, in calling this *Stealing*; and that it is the *Greatest* that has appear'd upon the *Stage* in *these Times*: It may be so indeed for all as I know, there has not been the like upon the *Stage*; but I am sure there has in the *Pulpits*, and that a worse too; when, 'twas not *Stealing* out of *Authors* and *Histories*, but out of *Narratives*, and out of the Mouths of *Perjur'd Informers*. This was the most *Ungrateful* and *Fatal Stealing* of these Times, that help'd to the effusion of so much innocent Blood. When the Reck'ning did not go then, that *F. Natalis* took his Testimonies *upon Trust* from such an one, and the *Collector* took the same *upon Trust* from him; but that *Oats* and *Bedloe* took their Testimonies upon Trust from the *Devil*, and the *Pulpits* took the same *upon Trust* from them. This was a *Bloody Stealing* indeed, and such as, one would think, is enough to make the *Pulpits* blush with Confusion to the Worlds end, however the Preachers have so soon worn it out of their Foreheads, and *absolv'd* themselves, without ever *Recanting* one Syllable of the *Forg'd Accusations* they so unjustly fix'd upon their Neighbor, Not one single *Peccavi*, not one *Mea Culpa*, even by word of Mouth from the *Pulpit*, tho' the Wickedness they have left *Recorded* under their Names in *Print*. Tho' by the by, the *Collector* even of these too, that appear'd the last Week, I think has his Failing too, (for *Collectors* it seems must be out.) For tho' he has set down some Names of *Authors*, from whence he made his *Collection*; yet he has omitted to point to the *Narratives*, the *Pages* and *Lines* from whence these *Authors* borrow'd the account: and therefore, if, according to our *Answerer's* Method, he had but taken *Passage by Passage*, and set down over against it in the Margin, *Oats's Narrative, First, Second, or Third Edition, such a Folio, such a Line*; *Bedloe's Narrative, such an Edition, Page,*

Page and Line, Printed in such a Place, First, Second, or Third Tear of the Plot, &c. This would have made it complete, beyond the Exceptions even of our present Noisy Caviller. But I pass now to the next *Accusation*, (for this is the *Trade* our Adversaries, from their late Masters Experience are best skill'd in, and know how to manage to the best advantage) tho' I first here ask the Reader's pardon, for entertaining him with such kind of Controversie as this: I am sensible how ungrateful it may be to some; but our Adversaries have brought the Matter into this Channel; they cannot *Answer* a *Book* now, without casting *Dirt* and *Infamy* upon the *Authors*: and there is no making them understand Reason, but by treating them in their own kind, that so they may be satisfi'd, as they pick Holes in other Men's Coats, that their *Escutcheon* is not without *Blots*. But what is the other Crime, I am call'd to account for?

'Tis a *much worse* than the Former, as the *Answerer* pretends. 'Tis for making use of an *Author* in this *Collection*, whose Books had been condemn'd by the *Pope* Two years before. But since for this he remits me to my *Father Confessor*, I'll e'en see to compound the matter with him as well as I can, and without any farther Apology here hasten to the Body of the *Answer*. Tho' by the way I cannot but fancy the *Answerer* has some further drift, in urging this Crime against me, of *Reading Forbidden Books*. He cannot but know, that *this Book* of his, as likewise all those Controversies that are writ by his Party, fall under the Censure of the *Pope's Bulls*, and are directly *Forbidden*. And being unwilling, I presume, they should be *Answer'd*, and their Insincere and Fraudulent dealing expos'd, he would fain persuade us, that 'tis *Unlawful to Read them*. I cannot but smile at the Contrivance; But this is not like to serve his turn. I'll let him see once more, that I read

Forbidden Books by Replying to the Petty Cavils of his *Answer* : and if he'll turn *Informer*, and go and tell *Father Confessor*, let him do it once more ; I'll run the hazard of his Complaints, and make my Peace as well as I can. And now to the Body of the *Answer*.

And here to shew his admirable Talent of *Trifling*, he begins his Quarrel (p. 3.) with the First Chapter of *Nubes Testium*. It seems I promis'd in the *Preface* of that *Collection*. to treat in it of the *Chief Points of Controversie*. And this makes the Gentleman *Wonder*, how I should come to begin it with the History of *Donatus*, and in shewing the Nature of *Schism*. For this, says he, is so far from being a chief Point, that it is no Point of Controversie at all betwixt us. Who can hear this Profound Difficulty propos'd by a Man that has dwelt so long amongst Books, without pitying him for his lost time ? Certainly a Man without turning over many Volumes in *Folio*, and even without the help of a *Tutor*, might discover, that to premit a Chapter in the beginning of a Treatise, by way of *Introduction*, or a *Preliminary Question*, tho' it do's not fall directly under the chief design of the Book, is no great matter of *Wonder*. And sure tho' the Business of *Schism* be suppos'd to be no Point of Controversie betwixt us, yet it may pass well enough as a proper *Introduction to Controversie* ; especially too in our Case, where if that one Business of *Schism* were truly Stated and Decided, all farther Controversies would soon be needless. But the *Answerer's* Temper is to be in love with *Cavilling*, and where he do's not find a Reason for it, he must at least pretend one, so not to lose the opportunity of so grateful an Exercise. Tho', I believe, there may be something more in it too than this ; For the *Fathers* all with one Voice speak so severely of the pernicious and damnable Nature of *Schism*, that it must needs be an uneasy Lesson to a *Separate Congregation* ; to a Church.

Church which being for many Ages a happy *Part* of the Catholic Communion, has of late Years cut it self off from the *Whole*, and by making a *Divison* without *Authority* or *Precedent*, has set up for it self. To such a *Church*, and to the Members of it, the *black Character* of *Schism* must needs be an unwelcom Sight, especially as 'tis set out by the *Fathers*. And therefore, tho' the Answerer wonders how this Chapter of *Schism* came to have a Place in *Nubes Testium*, yet 'tis no *Wonder* at all, why he should with so much earnestness betray his Desires of having it omitted as *Improper*, and, upon that Pretext, wave the Consideration of those Testimonies of the *Fathers* alledg'd upon that Subject. This is no *Wonder*, I say, at all: For however he's so confidently Positive, that this is no Point of Controversie at all, yet as far as I perceive by the Answerer, there is not likely to be so total an Agreement betwixt us in relation to this Point of *Schism*, as he fancies: For whilst he pretends (p. 6.) that the *Breaking the Unity of the Catholic Church*, is not *Schism*, unless when it is done *Causelessly*, and upon a *groundless Pretence*: and that otherwise 'tis Commendable and Necessary; In this he makes it a *Chief Point of Controversie*, whilst he differs both from *Us* and the *Fathers* cited in *Nubes Testium*, who positively deny, that there can be any *Just Cause* upon any score whatsoever, for *breaking the Unity of the Catholic Church*: and consequently, that whensoever 'tis done, 'tis done *Causelessly*; since there can be no *Just Cause* for the doing it. They are almost *S. Augustin's* own words: *There's nothing so Heinous* (says he) *as the Sacrilege of Schism: because there is no Just Necessity for Breaking Unity.* *Lib. 2. c. Ep. Parm. cap. 11.* And *St. Irenaus* said it long before: *For whatsoever Evil, They who Separate, says he, design to redress, 'tis much less than the destructive Evil of Schism.* *Lib. 4. adv. Hæres. cap. 62.* And here now let the Reader judge, whe-

ther there be not a Dispute between us as to this Point ; whether I was out for inserting this amongst the Controversies that are between us ; or He out in Cavilling with me for so doing.

The next Debate is concerning what the *Fathers* say of the *Pope's Supremacy* : which the Answerer pretends, is nothing to the Purpose. And if his Word is to be taken, then indeed, I think it is not much. St. *Irenæus* is quoted by me for asserting, *That the Tradition of the Church of Rome, and the Faith it has receiv'd from the Apostles and convey'd down to us, by the Succession of Bishops, is enough to confound all such, who through Self-love, Blindness, Malice, or any other account, do unduely assemble : For 'tis necessary, says he, that every Church should have recourse to this, by reason of its more POWERFUL PRINCIPALITY.* This the Answerer says is of no use, (p. 22.) and indeed if he means to his own *Separated Church*, 'tis very little, unless it be to condemn it. The *Father* says, that the *Tradition, Faith, and Succession of the Bishops of the Church of Rome, are enough to confound all others, who Separate from it.* This is of no use, cries the Answerer. He says farther, *that 'tis necessary all other Churches should recur to This.* This too is of no use. And as for its *more Powerful Principality*, which the same *Father* asserts, and assigns for the Reason of all ; yet this it seems do's not relate to the *Church*, but to the *Civil State of Rome.* And this, says the Answerer, *they have been told often enough.* Good, and Great ! We have been told so ; but when was it once prov'd ? Are you grown *Infallible* now, that we must take your Word for't ? But this is his Answering of the *Father*. When a *Father* speaks a little cross to his mind, the *Answerer* throws him by as of no use, and so the Work is done for that *Father*, and he must e'en make room for the next.

The next Testimony on this same Subject, is of *Optatus Milevitanus*, who calls the Bishop of Rome the *First Bishop*: Asserts that See to have been erected by *Peter*, whom he calls the *Head of all the Apostles*; 'That 'twas appointed for the maintaining a *Unity* amongst all other Churches; That none should set up any other Episcopal Chair in *Opposition to this*; That he would be a *Schismatic* and *Sinner*, who should erect another See to *contend with this*. Then having reckon'd up all the Bishops of Rome, beginning with *S. Peter*, to his time, he says, that all the World was in Communion with the then present *Pope*, with whom they agreed, as *One Body*. And lastly he tells his Adversaries, that *full of Presumptions and Lies, they had set themselves in Defiance with that Chair, and made a Schism*. All this again, with the Reverend Answerer, is of no use. 'Tis *Obscure*, he says; and because there's no *Protestancy* to be found in it; 'tis *False* and *Groundless*, (p. 23.) In this manner he treats the *Fathers* that are not for his turn, and this he calls *Answering*. And because the *Father* speaks so much downright *Popery*, he cannot pass him by without casting Dirt upon him (for that is the Answerer's last Refuge) and tells his Reader, that *Optatus Milevitanus*, that wrote thus, *had very little consider'd the Scriptures and Fathers before him*. And then confidently backs this unworthy *Calumny* with as notorious a *Fraud*; pretending that the *Father* in this Testimony maintains, *That the Chair of Rome was such, that the rest of the Apostles might not have Cathedra's* (or Episcopal Chairs) *for themselves*. Which *St. Optatus* no-where asserts, but only, That the Rest of the Apostles should not set up *Other Episcopal Chairs in Opposition to this of Rome*, or to *G O N T E N D* with it. For he that calls the Pope of Rome in the same Testimony, *Fellow Bishop*, (as the Answerer translates it) do's not certainly exclude all others from being *Bishops*, but only condemns those of *Sacrilege*,
who

who did *Separate* themselves from Communion of the Chair of *Peter*, and were at Defiance with it. This is his way of handling the *Fathers*, whilst they don't speak as the *Answerer* would have them, they lose all Respect with him, and they are put upon the same File with the *Representer*; They are either *Compilers*, take things upon Trust; or have little *consider'd* the *Scriptures* and *Fathers* before them.

In the like manner he treats *S. Jerom*, (p. 33.) For whilst this *Father* shews the Great Authority of *St. Peter*; The *Answerer* cries out, *By your leave S. Jerom*, I don't think so. And afterwards the same *Father* asserting, that *S. Peter* was appointed *HEAD* amongst the Apostles, so to take away all occasion of *Schism*; In comes the *Answerer* with an *I cannot believe it, tho' S. Jerom affirms it*. Thus our young conceited Whiffler undervalues the *Fathers* and *Doctors* of the Church. And this is his Answering of *Nubes Testium*. Had not he as good have sav'd all this labor of a dozen Sheets, and even in *One Line* have given a full Answer to the whole, by scornfully saying with his Ring-leader *Luther*, *I value not a thousand Fathers; if they say so, I say otherwise*. This would have agreed with our Adversary's Temper, who by his manner, seems to have a good Opinion enough of himself, for this and more.

In this manner he shifts off all those many Testimonies, that are alledg'd in behalf of the Pope's Supremacy, in *Nubes Testium*, and then boasts that they are direct contrary to what they are there brought to prove. 'Tis an admirable one what he says of the Passage of Pope *Victor* (p. 25.) Excommunicating the *Asiatic Bishops*, and no body at that time questioning his Authority for so doing. This is quoted in *Nubes Testium*, p. 25. out of *Eusebius*. And then comes the *Answerer*; 'Tis true, says he, that Power in the Bishop of *Rome* of Excommunicating the *Eastern Bishops*, was
not

not question'd, neither could it be ; *since every Bishop, says he, in the Catholic Church, and therefore be at Rome among the rest, might deny to Communicate with any other Bishop or Church, against which they thought they had sufficient reason for such a Suspension of Communion.* Thus fillily imposing upon his Reader, as if *Denying to Communicate with any other Bishop or Church,* were the same thing, as to *Excommunicate them,* or as *Eusebius* has it, to *Cut them off from the Body of the Universal Church.* Since every body knows, that to *Excommunicate others,* there is requir'd an *Authority or Jurisdiction* over them ; whilst *refusing Communion* may be done without any such *Power.*

Such kind of Turns as these he gives to the rest of those most clear and Pressing Testimonies of the Fathers there cited ; which are too many, and too impertinent to deserve a particular account. All that I shall observe upon this Point, is, That whereas all those Texts, with many others, relating to the ancient Bishops of *Rome* in the time of the Primitive Church, particularly of *Victor, Julius, Innocent, Cælestine, &c.* are understood in the very same Sense as I there set them down, by the most Eminent and Learned Protestants both *French, German, and English,* who with one consent do in Fact acknowledge, that those Prelates of the *Apostolic Chair* did Exercise a like Authority with that which is attributed to the *Pope,* by the Council of *Florence,* and condemn them upon this score, yet our young Graduat, without any Respect to the Learning of these Pillars and great Promoters of the *Reformation,* contradicts them all, and makes no more of them, than he do's of the *Representer* : For if they don't understand things according to his Measures, *They are mistaken.* Since therefore in all the Testimonies relating to those Prelates, I say no more than what the *Greatest Protestants* have confessedly own'd over and over ; I'll e'en leave our young Controvertist

trovertist to contest with them. It may be before he has done there, his Crest may be something fall'n. For my part, I am quite tir'd with his petty Shufflings, and therefore will come to his next Chapter of *Tradition*.

And here he intends to give me but little trouble, being in so good a Humor, (p. 37) as even to question, whether there be any Controversie at all in this Point, between the two Churches. And therefore as he had before told his Reader, (p. 8.) *That he could grant the Bishop of Rome to be the Successor of S. Peter, and that That See is the Center of the Catholic Communion, when possess'd by an Orthodox Bishop.* So here he frankly declares, *That the Tradition of the Catholic Church is to be receiv'd; That by Tradition they receiv'd the Holy Scriptures, and by Tradition know how to separate the Scriptures from Apocryphal Writings.* And that 'tis the Doctrin of his Church, *That there is no necessity of Express Scripture, for the Constitutions and Practices she enjoys, for the more Regular and Decent Service of God.* And consequently, that all that is produc'd in *Nubes Testium*, concerning this Point of *Tradition*, is not against, but conform to the Doctrin of the Church of England. This is more than every Doctor in his Church will grant; but we'll never quarrel with him for his good Nature: I am glad to hear that *both Churches* are agreed, as to all the Fathers there cited, say upon this Subject: That the *Answerer* and his Church, approve the making *Anniversary Oblations for the Dead.* The *Signing their Foreheads with the Sign of the Cross* at every going out and coming in, at sitting to Table, at lighting of Candles, at going to Bed, &c. The *Blessing the Water of Baptism, and the Oyl; the Exorcising, and Breathing on Infants that are to be Baptis'd, &c.* All which the Fathers say are Universally receiv'd and taught by the Catholic Pastors all over the Church. If the *Answerer* and his Church approve of all this, without any Authority of Scripture,
I am

I am content ; tho' I think there will still, notwithstanding all this, remain some Debate behind. For tho' he allows *Tradition* sufficient for the *Discipline* and *Practice* of the Church, yet not for any Point of *Doctrin*, and pretends the *Fathers* go no farther : I think he's something out here ; for the *Fathers* evidently confess, that even in Matters of *Belief*, the *Tradition* of the Catholic Church is the best Demonstration. As *Origen*, who as to the *Faith* concerning Christ, says, that *That is to be embrac'd, which by a Succession from the Apostles, is preserv'd in the Church by Ecclesiastical Tradition*. Nub. Test. p. 51. And again, *We are not to forsake*, says he, *Ecclesiastical Tradition, nor Believe otherwise, than as the Churches of God have Successively deliver'd down to us*. Ibid. *Tertullian* repeats the same. And however the Answerer shifts these off with saying, they relate only to *Ecclesiastical Rites* ; the contrary is very evident, whilst they write against *Heretics* and *Misbelievers*, and assert, that the Rule of their *Faith* ought to be, not their own *Interpretations of Scripture*, but the *Tradition of the Churches of God*. *St. Basil* likewise speaks of *Mysteries* and *Ancient Doctrins* to be receiv'd by *Tradition*. And so again *Epiphanius* says, the *Doctrins* they have receiv'd from God, are partly *in Writing*, and partly *without Writing*. And *Vincentius Lirinensis* declares, that Men ought not to lead Religion their own way, but take all such things for *Matters of Faith*, as have been receiv'd as such from their *Predecessors*.

In all these Places the *Fathers* speak expressly of Matters of *Doctrin* and *Faith* to be receiv'd as deliver'd down by *Tradition*. So that the Distinction of Matters of *Discipline* and Points of *Faith*, in relation to *Tradition*, is only an Invention of the Answerer, but no-where to be found in the *Fathers*, who own *Tradition* to be sufficient and even necessary for Both. *St. Gregory Nyssen's* words are plain
C enough,

enough, who makes this Declaration against the *Heretics* of his time; *Let it be known, that 'tis a sufficient Proof of our Doctrin, that we have receiv'd it by Tradition from our Ancestors.* The Answerer expounds this indeed (p. 41.) not to mean any *Point of Faith*, but only the *Interpretation of it*, wherein he allows the *Tradition of Antiquity to be highly Useful and Necessary.* This is another Shift of his: but however, this will go a great way; for if he'll allow *Tradition to be highly Useful, and even Necessary in the Interpretation of Points of Faith*, we'll thank him for this: for by it I believe the greatest part of our Differences are likely to come to an issue; whilst this is a great part of what we claim, but is deny'd us by our Adversaries.

In the next Chapter of *Nubes Testium*, which declares it to have been a Doctrin of the Primitive Church, to believe an *Honor to be due to the Saints in Heaven*; and that *'tis profitable to observe Days with Solemnity in memory of them*, the Answerer is again very favourable, owning (p. 43.) the *Testimonies* there produc'd to have been needless, since he's willing to grant the whole, as a matter out of dispute, and as the Practice of the *First Ages of the Church*: He's express as to the *Honoring Saints, in observing Days in Honor of them*, (p. 43.) and, I suppose, in the manner there declar'd by the *Fathers*, viz. *In the whole Country round about, going to Visit the Church of the Saint, whose Day is observ'd in Honor and Memory of him*, as St. Basil there says. *To assemble together in Honor of the Saints*, as St. Chrysostom. *To adore the holy Martyrs, not with Divine Worship, but that of Affection and Honor*, as St. Cyril Alex. *To hasten to Church, there to honor the Martyrs, who by the effusion of their Blood, have prepar'd Salvation for us, and offer'd themselves to God, a Propitiatory Host, for the Remission of Sins*, as St. Ambrose. *To Celebrate the Memory of the Martyrs, with a Religious Solemnity, so to be partakers of their Merits and Prayers* as St. Au-

St. *Augustin*. All this the Answerer seems to own, as the Doctrin and Practice of the Primitive Church, whilst he makes no Exception against any of the Testimonies enforcing this *Point* ; but says, I needed not to have brought these Passages. And these Concessions of his I cannot pass by without Thanks ; 'tis more than what some former Adversaries of mine would have yielded to. I remember one, in his *Reply to my Reflections*, sets up an *Infallible Distinction*, as he calls it, of *Civil and Religious Worship* (p. 66.) where he says, *That all Civil Respects are confin'd to this World ; and that we have no Intercourse with the other World, or the Invisible Inhabitants of it, but what is Religious*. This Gentleman would have given our present Answerer, if he had been Pupil under him, better Advice, than to have so freely granted all this : 'Tis likely he would have directed him to have given the *Fathers* upon *this Point*, a like Turn with all the rest, to have pretended them *Obscure*, or of *no Use*, or to have begg'd their leave, for that he *could not believe them*. This might have pass'd well enough ; but to allow the *Saints* to be *Honor'd* as the *Fathers* there declare ; to be *Honor'd by assembling together in their Honor, with Solemn Festivals*, and the *Observation of Days*, is likely to be made a *Religious Honor*, since 'tis paid to the *Invisible Inhabitants of the next World* : and the next Step is, that the *Answerer* and *Fathers* are as guilty of *Constructive Idolatry* as the *Papists*. But however, since the Answerer joyns with us in this Point, we must not reproach him with it, but look forward to the next.

And in this, being of the *Invocation of Saints*, he appears with some Disconfidence of his Cause, (p. 43.) And therefore tho' he pretended in the Title Page, that *Antiquity* for the first *Five hundred years*, did not favor this, or any Doctrin of the Church of *Rome* : here he has consider'd better on't, and therefore cutting off *Two* of the

Five, he says, we cannot shew this to have been the Practice of the First *Three Centuries*. So that here he is willing to give us the *Fourth* and *Fifth* Ages, as Practising the *Invocation of Saints*. This is no small Favor again, especially from a Man, who has the Knack of making the *Fathers* speak what Sense he pleases: And I believe 'tis a Concession that may have an Influence upon some Persons, who have so often found it asserted by *Protestant Authors*, that the Purity of Religion was preserv'd without Spot or Corruption, for the First *Four* or *Five hundred Years*; That Bishop *Jewel* claims all the *Fathers* for the space of *Six hundred Years*. And if this be True, then 'tis easie to Infer, That if this Doctrin of the *Invocation of Saints* was practis'd, as the Answerer grants, in the *Fourth* and *Fifth* Centuries, that 'tis according to the Purity of the *Ancient Faith*, and such as *Protestants* are oblig'd to embrace. And this they'll be farther convinc'd of, when they reflect, what Fathers are own'd Abettors of it, viz. *S. Basil, S. Ambrose, S. Chrysostom, S. Hierom, S. Augustin, Theodoret, &c.* who all liv'd in the time wherein this is own'd to have been practis'd, and were so far from reproving it, as *contrary to Scripture*, and an *Innovation*, that they even did it themselves, and exhorted others to do the like; and that even *One* of the *Four First General Councils* was held within the same time, without ever Censuring it as an *Error*, tho' even before that, this Practice is own'd to have taken root in many Places. The Silence of such an *Assembly*, joyn'd with the *Authority* of the now mention'd *Fathers*, some of which were *Members* even in *Three* of the *First Four General Councils*, and the *Concessions* of *Protestants*, owning those Times to have been *Pure*, may, 'tis likely, prevail more for the establishing this Doctrin, than all the petty Cavils of our *Modern Separate Doctors* can do to undervalue it. And may not hence farther be drawn an Argument of some force

force to prove, that the same was the Doctrin of the foregoing Ages? For since 'tis certain the Fathers now mention'd had a greater advantage of knowing what was taught and practis'd in those Ages immediately foregoing, than any who live now, coming behind at so great a Distance: since 'tis as certain too, that those same *Fathers* were as Eminent for *Vertue* and *Learning*, and as jealous of the *Purity of the Gospel*, of admitting or practising *Innovations*, as any *Reformer* of these latter Times: May not hence, I say, be drawn an Argument of force, to convince, that what *those Fathers* then taught and practis'd, was no *Innovation*; but that most certainly Those are the *Innovators*, who under the pretext of *Reforming*, depart from them, who are the best Witnesses of the *Primitive Faith*, and whose *Piety and great Abilities* set them above the *Contempt or Reproach of any, but Infidels and Apostates*.

But the *Answerer* has one Shift left here: He says, (p. 44.) that tho' these *Fathers* us'd *Interpellations* and *Requests* to the *Saints* departed, yet these are very different from the present Practice of the Church of Rome, which has turn'd those *Requests* into *Formal Prayers* and Services, and inserted them into her most *Solemn Devotions* and *Litanies*. Here the Reader is put off with a pretty Distinction betwixt using *Requests* and *Prayers* to Saints, as if to offer a *Request* and a *Prayer* to a Saint were not all one. 'Tis so near being the same, I believe, with most Men, that they'll scarce see so much reason for condemning the Church of Rome, of departing from the *Fathers*, for changing *Requests* into *Prayers*, as all *Reform'd Churches*, for turning even *Requests* out of doors as *Idle and Superstitions*: For since the *Fathers* offer'd *Requests* to *Saints*, how do's the Church of *England* justify herself in laying them by, whilst at the same time she pretends to follow the *Fathers*. But as for the *Innovation* laid to the Church of
Rome,

Rome, for my part, I can see nothing now commanded by this Church in this kind, but what was perform'd as solemnly, and as expressly approv'd by those *Fathers*. What more *Formal Prayer*, then that of St. Gregory Nyssen to St. Theodore Martyr? *Intercede and Pray for our Country, before the Lord of the Universe.—Thou knowest our Desires, our Wants.—Ask for Peace.* What more Solemn than that Exhortation of St. John Chrysostom to his Flock? *Let us visit them (the Martyrs) not only on this Day of their Festival, but also on other Days; Let us Pray to them, and heartily beseech them to be our Patronesses: And then he gives the reason; Because their Interest is great, not only whilst alive, but dead also; nay, much greater since their Death.* What more express order than that of St. Ambrose? *The Angels are to be Pray'd to, who are appointed for our Defence: The Martyrs are to be Pray'd to, whose Patronage we justly claim.—They can Pray for the Remission of our Sins—Let us not be ashamed to call them in as Advocates for our Failings.* And St. Augustin: *'Tis an Injury to Pray for a Martyr, to whose Prayers we ought to recommend our selves.* Is not here express *Praying to Saints* departed? Is not here a Solemn Performance of it, even in their *Public Assemblies*, which likewise Theodoret confirms more at large? Is not here a *Positive Instruction* for the Doing it? *Obsecrandi sunt Angeli, Obsecrandi sunt Martyres; cujus nos Debemus Orationibus commendari.* So that there needs no more than a bare reading of the *Fathers*, to discover all the Pretences of the Answerer, to be nothing better than a piece of Controversial Legerdemain. And this may be seen farther in his next Section, where he pretends to Answer the Chapter concerning *Relics*.

In this again he retires within the *Three First Centuries*, (p. 48.) But for the *Fourth* and *Fifth*, he dares not put the Cause upon their Verdict; expressly owning, that in the
Fourth

Fourth Century this *Superstition* of paying Veneration to Holy Relics took root in the Church. And therefore his Commendation of the Church of England is, that she is more careful to imitate what she finds Written and Practis'd in the Scriptures themselves, than to imitate what the Fourth Age of the Church began to Practise, — wherein Plenty and Prosperity let loose the Reins to some Peoples Fancies, and made that a part of Religion, which was never any before. Now to understand throughly this Commendation of the Church of England, we are to look what kind of strange Fathers those were, that liv'd in this Fourth Century, which She dares not follow; and at first sight, Who are they but S. Basil, S. Gregory Nyssen, S. Gregory Nazianzen, S. Chrysostom, S. Ambrose, S. Jerom, S. Augustin, Theodoret, &c. These are they, who in the Church of Englands Eye are so contemptible, that She dares not imitate them; no, Plenty and Prosperity let loose the Reins to these Peoples Fancies, and they made that a part of Religion, which was never any before. Strange Commendation of a Church, which pretends to follow the Fathers! I thought hitherto that our chief Controversie had been, Whether of the two Churches was guilty of Novelty; and that we were to be try'd by the Writings of the Primitive Fathers: To this Trial the Church of England has pretended hitherto to stand, and the Answerer (p. 2.) was content to joyn issue with us, and refer to this. And now all on a sudden, the most Eminent and Learned of the Fathers, the most Celebrated Lights of the Primitive Church, are thrown by; Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerom, Augustin. &c. are excepted against, their Writings are nothing but some Peoples Fancies; and they don't deliver what Conscience, Piety, and Learning suggested to them, but only the Extravagances of a Loose Judgment, vitiated and debauch'd by Plenty and Prosperity. Well — were it not the disappointing the Reader, I would spend no more Ink upon a Man, having none Black enough

enough for him, that has no more *Forehead*, than thus most insolently to trample upon the *Fathers* ; but I leave him to the Character of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, who has mark'd out all those, who *Contemn* or *Reproach* the *Fathers*, either for *Infidels* or *Apostates* ; and here let him take his choice.

For our parts, we profess a Veneration for those *Holy Fathers*. And as we Honor them for their Learning and Piety, so we desire to follow their *Faith* and *Practice* : And 'tis no light Argument of the Truth of our Cause, to see our Adversaries casting These by with reproach, for maintaining those very *Doctrins* and *Practices*, for which they condemn us at this day, so with the same Hand *Reforming* both *Us* and the *Fathers* too. This severe Reflection upon the pretended *Reformation*, I perceive the *Answerer* was something sensible of, when (p. 50.) he seems willing to strike in again with these *Holy Fathers*, granting that what They did in *keeping the Relics of Saints with Respect and Veneration, and believing that God wrought Miracles by them*, was nothing but what They might do, and They might do it too, says he : Nay farther, he makes this Declaration ; *I do not see, says he that we could have broken Communion with them upon such an account*. Is not this a rare Game of *Fast and Loose* with the *Holy Fathers* of this *Fourth Age* ; one while Censuring them of *Superstitious Innovations*, of searching for *Relics*, of believing Miracles to be wrought by them ; and then again Approving all they did, and Censuring the Censure ? But what Remedy, when the Cause cannot be manag'd otherwise ?

But however he can find in his heart to allow of what the *Fathers* did in this kind ; yet the *Papists* are certainly to be brought in *Guilty* : For they have out-gone, as he says, even the Practices of the *Fourth Century* ; not being contented to pay an *Honor* and *Veneration* to *Holy Relics*, as the *Fathers* of that Age did, but even *Worshipping* them too,

too, and that with a *Religious Worship*. This is their Crime, and a part of that Pretext upon which they ground their Separation : But who is there that do's not presently discover, that this is only a *Reform'd Juggle* ? When the Cause will not hold, then their Business is to quarrel about Words. The *Fathers* paid an *Honor and Veneration* to *Relics*, and they might do it ; but the *Papists* *Worship* them. A poor, pitiful Cant, to deceive the Silly. Let the *Answerer* speak plain ; Are the *Papists* taught to do any more than what the *Fathers* did ? All he proves upon the *Papists*, and for which he condemns them, is using these Acts of *Prostrations, Kissings, Processions, Resorts to Holy Relics, for Cures and Assistance in Distresses* ; and for this Reason they *Worship* them, they pay a *Religious Worship* to them. And pray, if the *Answerer* has read *Nubes Testium*, let him tell me, whether this be not the very thing that the *Fathers* of the *Fourth Age* there cited, taught and practis'd ; who yet, as he says, did nothing but what *They might do* ? Do's not St. *Gregory Nyssen* declare the Practice of the Faithful, in esteeming it an Happiness to *Touch the Bones of the Martyrs, in Kissing their dead Bodies, laying them to their Eyes, their Mouths, their Ears, and to all their Senses ; and then Praying to the Martyrs to make Intercession for them, as if alive and Present*. Do not St. *Gregory Nazianzen, S. Chrysostom, St. Jerom, St. Augustin, Theodoret*, give a large account of the *Processions* that were made in Transferring *Holy Relics and Martyrs Bodies* from *Rome to Antioch ; from Palestine to Thrace, to Constantinople, to Chalcedon ; The Bishops* carrying them on their Shoulders richly adorn'd, through the Crowds of People, Singing forth the Praises of the *Trinmphant Martyrs, and their Redeemer* ? Don't they confess the *Martyrs Bodies* to *Sanctifie*, not only the Places where they lie, but likewise those that come to visit them, by reason of a *Blessing* attending their Bodies ?

D

That

That their *Bodies* do not lie each in their own Monument, but are *divided* among several Cities and Villages, and are Honor'd as their *Physicians*, *Protectors* and *Guards*. That many are dispossess'd of Devils, by only *touching* their *Garments*. And many cur'd of *Diseases*, not only by their *Relics*, but even by *Handkerchiefs* and other *Linnen*, which have but touch'd those Sacred Remains? This is what those Eminent *Fathers* of the Church deliver, as the Doctrin and Practice of the *Fourth Age*: And is not this the very same that *Catholics* do at this day? Are not here those very *Actions* and *Practices*, for which the Church of *Rome* is condemn'd? So that the *Answerer* in pretending that those *Fathers* Honor'd Holy *Relics*, but that the *Papists* *Worship* them, is but one of his *Shifts*, to impose upon the Unwary; but altogether groundless and unreasonable, whilst what the *Fathers* did, and the *Papists* do, is nothing but the same; which is not a *Worshipping and Adoring the Relics of Martyrs*, (as St. *Jerom* says) *but an Honoring the Relics of Martyrs, so to Adore him whose Martyrs they are.* And how far the Church of *England* is justifiable in *breaking* Communion upon this account, I leave to the Reader, who may here plainly discover, that under pretext of *Reforming*, She has not onely *Separated* from the Church of *Rome*, but departed likewise from the *Primitive Fathers*, as the *Answerer* himself plainly owns, whilst he confesses, that She dares not follow what the Church of *Christ* practis'd, when She was near *Four hundred years old*, (p. 51.)

The *Answerer* in his next Chapter (p. 51.) treats of *Praying for the Dead*. And here again he most liberally grants, That the *Fathers of the Primitive Church* practis'd *Praying for the Dead*, and own'd such *Prayers* to be *advantageous to the Souls departed*. And that this is no *Point of Controversie betwixt us*, but a *Truth which no one denies*. *Ib.* And farther adds, (p. 53.) *That the Fathers in the First Ages us'd Oblations*

Oblations and Prayers for the Dead, nay and this also for *Pardon of Sins*. All this he grants with a great freedom, repeating it over again, that in proving this, we only prove that, *which no body denies*. I will not stay here enquiring, how the *Answerer* and his *Church*, who in the very *Leaf* before was so precise, as not to follow a *Practice* touching *Relics*, because She finds no *Command* about it in the *Holy Scriptures*, comes now so freely to allow of a *Practice*, which is not so much as mention'd throughout their whole *Bible*, no more than the former? Or why, confessing this to have been a *Practice* of the *First Ages*, which She pretends to follow; She do's not perform it Her self? But I proceed to reply to this Chapter, wherein he pretends, that this *Practice* of *Praying for the Dead* advances nothing towards the proving a *Purgatory*; since those Souls the *Fathers* Pray'd for, were believ'd to be in a State of *Light*, of *Joy* and *Comfort*, without any word, as he says, of delivering them from *Pains* and *Torments*, (p. 53.)

And in order to this I desire the Reader to observe, that the supposing those Souls, for which the *Fathers* Pray'd, to be in a State of *Joy* and *Comfort*, do's most nearly agree with the present *Practice* and *Doctrine* of the Church of *Rome*, which at the same time that She Prays for the *Relief* of the Souls departed, do's likewise mention something of their enjoying a *Peace* and *Quiet*. Thus it is in the *Canon* of the *Mass*, where the Priest commemorating the Souls departed, says thus: *Memento, Domine, Famulorum, Famularumque tuarum, qui nos praeceperunt cum Signo Fidei & dormiunt in somno Pacis*; Remember, O Lord, thy Servants, who are gone before us with the Sign of Faith, and Rest in the Sleep of Peace. And then immediately after adds, *Ipsis Domine, & omnibus in Christo quiescentibus, locum Refrigerii, Lucis & Pacis, ut indulgeas deprecamur*; We beseech thee, O Lord, to grant to these, and all that Rest in Christ,

a *Place of Comfort, of Light and Peace*. Where 'tis evident, she supposes those *Souls*, for which she offers Prayers and sues for Mercy, to be at *rest in the Sleep of Peace*, and at *rest in Christ*. And this is very agreeable with the State of *Purgatory*, where there is a kind of *Rest and Quiet*; where the *Interior Powers* of the *Souls* are well order'd and compos'd; The *Understanding* settled in the *Light of Faith*; the *Will* inflam'd with the *Love of God*; the *Imagination* undisturb'd, and *Secure Hopes* of once enjoying God, filling the *Souls* with a happy *Resignation and Comfort*. In this manner is that Place esteem'd a State of *Comfort and Joy* as well by our *Divines* now, as by the *Ancient Fathers*. And yet on the other side, those *Souls* being under a *Restraint and Banishment* from the Sight of God, and at the same time having by *Faith* a clear apprehension of God's Perfections, and by *Charity* a most intense Love of his Goodness, and consequently a *Longing Desire* of seeing and enjoying him, they from hence suffer a most afflicting Anguish, whilst they see themselves detain'd from his Presence, and there miserably tormented for the Neglects of their pass'd Life. Under these different Considerations may this Place be a State of *Comfort and Joy*, and yet of *Affliction and Pains* too. So that all that the *Answerer* produces out of the *Fathers* supposing those *Souls* for which they Pray'd, to be in a State of *Rest and Comfort*, do's not at all overthrow the Doctrin of this *Third State*, but rather establish and confirm it, it being nothing but what the Church of *Rome* now do's; and especially whilst with her in all those Prayers, the *Fathers* likewise suppose those same *Souls* to be in *Affliction and Anguish*, and capable of being reliev'd by their Prayers. And this is all that is requir'd in our Profession of Faith, in which 'tis said, *I hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the Souls there detain'd, are reliev'd by the Suffrages of the Faithful.*

And

And what more evident than this in the *Fathers*, whilst in recommending the *Souls departed*, they pray that they may be *receiv'd into the State of Bliss*; They pray for a *Refreshment for them*; that they *may find Relief*; to *find Mercy for them*; to bring *Relief to them*; to render God *Propitious to them*; that they may be treated with *Greater Mercy*, than their *Sins* deserve; to obtain *Mercy* for them, in order to a *Full Discharge*; to obtain *Pardon* for all their *Sins of Frailty*; for the *Remission* of their *Sins* contracted after *Baptism*? Which are all the Expressions of the *Fathers* cited upon this Subject in *Nubes Testium*. Is not this plainly to own, that these *Souls*, for which they offer'd their Prayers, were in a State capable of being *Reliev'd*; whilst they so expressly petition for *Relief*, for *Mercy*, for *Refreshment* for them? And do's not this again suppose some *Third State*? For it being *Needless* to *Pray thus*, for those that are in *Heaven*; there being no *Want* there at all, no want of *Relief*, of *Refreshment*, of *Pardon*; there being no *Guilt* there of *Sins*, and consequently no Place of *Pardon* for them. And it being again as *fruitless* to pray for those in *Hell*, that State being wholly Irreversible; there must of necessity be suppos'd some *Third State*, in which the *Souls* are capable of *Relief*, of *Refreshment*, of *Pardon*. And this *St. Chrysostom* delivers very clearly, *Hom. 32. in Mat.* where exhorting Parents to *Pray* for their Children deceas'd, he makes this Distinction: *If you think He (your Son) liv'd wholly in the Divine Grace, afford him something of yours, for the Increase of his Glory*. Here he supposes such an one to be in *Heaven*, and that *Alms* or *Prayers* offer'd for him, may contribute, he do's not say here to his *Relief* or *Pardon*; but for *Increase of Glory*; But then, *If you think he died not exempt from the Guilt of Sin, give him what belong'd to him, so to discharge him from that Guilt*. Here he supposes him to be in a *State* consistent with *Guilt*, and likewise admitting

mitting of a *Discharge*: This cannot be *Heaven*, where there can be no *Guilt*; nor *Hell*, from whence there can be no *Discharge*: therefore some other State consistent both with *Guilt* and *Discharge*. Which we call a *Third State*, or *Purgatory*.

And this *Third State* St. *Augustin* delivers very expressly in *Enchir. c. 109.* where he thus delivers his Judgment: *'Tis not to be deny'd, but that the Souls departed are reliev'd by the Devotion of their living Friends, when the Sacrifice of our Mediator is Offer'd, or Alms are given for them in the Church. And these are a Relief to such Souls, which in their Life-time did deserve to have this Help after Death: For there is a certain manner of Life neither so Good, as not to stand in need of these Helps after Death; neither so Wicked, as to be out of a Condition of being thus Reliev'd after Death.* And in the next Chapter he thus pursues this Subject: *For there are some, says he, so Good, as not to stand in need of these things; and there are again others so Wicked, that after Death they are not capable of receiving help from them.*

Are not here *Three States of Souls* asserted by St. *Augustin* after this Life? One of Souls so Good, as not to stand in need of Relief from the Prayers and Alms of the Living: Another of Souls so Wicked as to be wholly incapable of being Reliev'd by such Means: And a Third of such Souls, which are neither so Good, as not to want Relief; nor so Wicked, as to be incapable of such Relief: What can be more clear and express than this? And yet the *Answerer* with his wonted Confidence, boasts of the *Fathers* saying nothing in behalf of our *Doctrin*, which asserts a *Third State of Souls*, capable of being Reliev'd by the Prayers of the Faithful Living.

And here again may the Reader observe another Shift of the *Answerer*: for when he perceives the *Fathers* to be so Plain and Full in their Prayers for the Souls departed, and that for their Relief and Refreshment too: He strives to raise

raise a Mist before the Readers Eyes, pretending (p. 62.) That the Prayers put up by the Ancients were for the Best of Men, for the Martyrs themselves, for those whom they believ'd to be with the Lord in his Heavenly Kingdom; and so were nothing but Testifications of their Love to them, hoping by such Prayers and Alms to procure for them an Increase of Glory. Thus he labors to deceive: As if all the Prayers of the Ancients for the Souls departed, were only for their Increase of Glory; whenas 'tis here so evident from St. *Augustin*, that they pray'd for such Souls as were in want of Relief; which is very different from Petitioning for Increase of Glory, with all Men of Reason, who know that 'tis not a State of Glory, where there's Want of Relief. But this holy Father has taken farther care to defeat all such sinister Interpretations as this of the *Answerer*, especially (*ib. c. 110.*) where he distinguishes Three Sorts of Prayers for the Souls departed: When the Sacrifice of the Altar, says he, or Alms are offer'd for all the Faithful departed: For such Souls as are VERY GOOD, they are a THANKSGIVING-OFFERING; For such as are not VERY BAD, they are a PROPITIATION: For such as are VERY WICKED, altho' they are no RELIEF to them, yet they are some kind of Consolation to the Living. In which words is clearly discover'd this Fraud of the *Answerer*, whilst this Holy Father distinguishes so plainly the different Effects these Prayers have for such as are in Glory, and for others who stand in need of Mercy. For the former, they being in *Thanksgiving*; and for the later, by way of *Atonement*. And this again the same S. *Augustin* delivers, *Tract. 84. in Joan.* Where Discourfing of the Martyrs, We do not, says he, make mention of them at the Altar, so as to offer up Prayers for them, as we do for others, who rest in Peace; but rather that they would Pray for us, that we may follow their Example. This same Distinction is in St. *Chrysostom* in the place

place above-mention'd : *If you think*, says he, *your Son died wholly in the Divine Grace, afford him something of yours, for the Increase of his Glory : If you think he died not exempt from the Guilt of Sin, give what belong'd to him, so to discharge him of that GUILT.* This Testimony I repeat here again, to let the Reader see the insincere and fraudulent Dealing of the *Answerer*, who reflecting upon this Testimony of *St. Chrysostom*, says (p. 58.) that it do's not reach our purpose, since it *ONLY* advises the Oblation of Alms for the Increase of Happiness to his Son's Soul. Where the Reader, for a trial of Skill, may ask of the *Answerer* with an Eye upon his Forehead, to see if he blushes, What means this *ONLY* ? Do's *St. Chrysostom* then *only* advise him to offer for the Increase of Happiness to his Son's Soul ? What means then his bidding him pray for the Discharge of his Guilt, if he died not wholly exempt from Sin ? Is this *only* for the Increase of Glory ? Is the Discharge of Guilt, and Increase of Glory all one ? But I leave the *Answerer* here with his *Only*, and in the mean time I'll consider upon another Assertion of his, where he seems to say, that in the *Fathers* there is not a word of Pains and Torments to be undergone in this *Third State*.

And in this Point I find him again expressly contrary to *St. Augustin*, who (*De Civitat. Dei, lib. 21. cap. 24.*) speaking of such as depart this Life under the Guilt of lighter Sins ; *It is certain*, says he, *that such being purg'd by TEMPORAL Pains, which their Souls suffer before the Day of Judgment, shall not be condemn'd to eternal Torments, when they receive their Bodies.* And again (*cap. 13.*) *Some suffer TEMPORAL Punishment in this Life only, others after their Death ; others both in this Life and in the next too, but still before that last and terrible Judgment.* In which words is positively asserted a State of Souls in the next Life suffering a Temporal Punishment before the Day of Judgment.

Which

Which being not *Heaven*, where there can be no *Punishment* at all ; Nor *Hell*, where the *Punishment* is *Eternal* ; It is of necessity some other *Third State*. And since we have now found in the *Fathers*, a Practice of Praying for *Souls d-parted*, and that not only for the *Increase of Glory*, but for the *Pardon of their Sins*, for the *Discharge of Guilt*, for their *Relief and Refreshment*, and that they may be *receiv'd into Bliss* ; what need we more for the proving this *Third State* of Souls, or *Purgatory*, which we now hold, to have been taught by the *Fathers* ? And this however the *Answerer* denies : Yet *Peter Martyr*, who 'tis likely knew as much of them as he, is of another mind, (*Loc. Com. Cl. 3. c. 9. §. 52.*) where he owns, that the *Greatest part of the Fathers were inclin'd to the allowing a Purgatory*. And as for the *Greeks*, tho' the *Answerer* says, they disown the belief of any such Place ; yet if we hearken to *Gabriel Philadelp.* a Member of the Greek Church, we may perceive, that the Difference between the *Eastern and Western Church* is chiefly about a *Name*, whilst the *Latins* dividing the State of Souls in the next Life into *Three*, viz. *Heaven, Hell, and Purgatory* ; the *Greeks* allow but of the *Two First* ; but then in *Hell* they acknowledge *many Mansions*, and *different sorts of Torments*, some *Eternal* and others *Temporal*, answerable to the Guilt of the Souls. And such as undergo only *Temporal Pains*, they own capable of *Relief and Mercy*, and that one day they shall have a *Full Discharge*. Which is little different from the *Doctrin* of the *Western Church* bating only *Names*. We need not therefore insist longer on this Point, which is so clearly prov'd, but look forward towards the next, which is concerning the *Sacrament of the Eucharist*.

And in this I profess I am quite at a loss, especially as to what he asserts for the *Doctrin of his Church*, which is so beyond all *Sense and Reason*, that whosoever renounces

Transubstantiation for its *Difficulty*, and subscribes to this, as he has deliver'd it, must mock his own Judgment, and make *Contradictions* to be a *Mystery* of an *Easie Belief*. First then he says, (p. 65.) that *Christ's Body* is **REALLY present in the Eucharist**. Then in the very next Page he says, 'tis the *Body or Flesh of Christ* **FIGURATIVELY ONLY**. And within four Lines again he grants, that *It is the Flesh and Blood of Christ* absolutely, without any addition of *Really* or *Figuratively*. In the next Page 'tis not *Christ's TRUE Natural Body*, but his **FIGURATIVE, or SYMBOLICAL Body**. And again in the next Page, he says, *In the Eucharist we do REALLY receive the Body and Blood of Christ*. And then again (p. 72.) 'Tis his **SACRAMENTAL or FIGURATIVE Body**. Thus he plays backward and forward in declaring the Doctrin of his Church: And because some have urg'd it against his Church, that if the *Sacrament* be only a *Figure* of *Christ's Body*, to be receiv'd in *Remembrance* of Him and his *Passion*, that then there is *no Mystery* in it at all, he's resolv'd to elude the *Difficulty*, and be sure to make a *Mystery* of it; and therefore with him the *Sacrament* is **REALLY Christ's Body**, and yet 'tis **FIGURATIVELY only his Body**. *Christ's Body* is there **REALLY** present, and yet 'tis *only* his **SYMBOLICAL Body**: which is a *Mystery* next to that of *Christ's Body* being *Really* and *not Really* present in the *Sacrament*. And who is there can conceive what this is? If *Christ's Body* be *Really* there, we must believe it to be *Really* there: And if it be *Figuratively ONLY*, we must believe it to be *Figuratively ONLY*; and that's the same as *not Really*; and what's this but *Really* and *not Really*?

'Tis evident to all Sense and Reason, that what is *only* a *Symbol* or *Figure* of *Christ*, is not *Really Christ*. And therefore when we find by Scripture, that a *Vine*, a *Door*, a *Lamb*,
a *Shep-*

a *Shepherd*, are *Figures* only or *Symbols* of *Christ*, we do not, nor cannot apprehend, that a *Vine*, a *Door*, a *Lamb*, are *Really Christ*; or that *Christ* is *Really* present in such *Symbols*, but *Figuratively* only: that is, that Those Things are *Figures* of *Christ*, but not *Really Christ*. How then can we possibly conceive, that if the *Sacramental Bread* be only *Figuratively* his *Body*, that yet *Christ* is there *Really* present: or that his *Flesh* and *Blood* is R E A L L Y in that which is only a *Figure* of them? 'Tis easily to be understood, what some say, that the *Bread* of the *Sacrament* is only a *Sign* or *Figure* of *Christ's Body*: or that it *Signifies* his *Body*. As likewise what others say, That *Christ's Body* is *Really* there present with the *Bread*, by *Consubstantiation*. I can understand too, what means, that the Substance of the *Bread* is *Chang'd* into his *Body*: But this *Church-of-England Mystery*, that *Christ's Body* is *Figuratively* O N L Y there present, and yet *Really* too, is a thing I cannot possibly apprehend. So that, as far as I perceive, whilst the *Church of England* renounces the Belief of *Transubstantiation*, for its pretended Difficulties, for its being a *Monstrous*, a *Contradictious* Doctrine; She has declar'd for a *Mystery*, if this be Hers, of far greater Difficulty, and Consistent neither with good *Sense* nor *Reason*, at least, as this Author has deliver'd it: who, 'tis likely, being unwilling to be Confuted, was resolv'd not to be understood. This as to *His* Doctrine.

But now when he comes to *Ours*, all his Concern is, that the *Fathers* should not appear to deliver that very Doctrine in this *Mystery*, which we at this day profess and maintain. And because They speak too plainly, to be understood in any other Sense, besides that of *Our Church*, he dares not refer the Reader to the perusal of their Testimonies, and trust him alone with the understanding them: no, this would likely put an end to the Debate. He there-

fore takes his Reader by the Hand, and leads him through a great part of them ; and then holding out his *Mercurial Finger* to every one as they come in their turn, he tells him, *This is to be understood so ; This means so ; And this signifies so, &c.* St. Ignatius says, That the *Sacrament is the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ*. The Interpreter then puts in, *This must be Figuratively only*. The Council of Nice asserts, *That upon the Holy Table is plac'd the Lamb of God, which takes away the Sins of the World, unbloodily Sacrific'd there by the Priests ; And that the Faithful Truly receive his Precious Body and Blood*. And then the Interpreter : All this is by *Faith only* : 'tis not meant *Christ's True Natural Body, but his Symbolical Body*. St. Hilary affirms a *Natural Existence of Christ within us ; That there's no doubting of the Reality of his Flesh and Blood in the Eucharist ; That both by the Profession of Christ himself, and by our Faith, 'tis Truly Flesh, and Truly Blood*. Is not this true ? It may not indeed be true to those, who deny Christ to be God. The Interpreter here is put to't for his *This means* : And therefore confesses *This Father* to speak different from the rest, tho' it be nothing but what *Christ himself, as likewise the Fathers, deliver'd ; My Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed*. And then he comes with, *I think* this denotes, that in the Eucharist we do **R E A L L Y** receive the Body and Blood of Christ. The Father had Censur'd those that did not believe so, for *Deniers of Christ's Divinity*. And therefore the Answerer comes in with his *I think* ; that so he may not pass quite for an *Arian*.

St. Cyril next Instructing his Catechumens, declares positively, That since *Christ himself affirms of the Bread, This is my Body*, and likewise of the Cup, *This is my Blood* : Who dares be so bold as to doubt of it ? In Cana of Galilee he chang'd Water into Wine ? And do's he not deserve to be credited, that he chang'd Wine into his Blood ? Under the Form of Bread

is given to thee his Body, and the Blood under the Form of Wine. Do not judg of the Thing by the Tast, but rather take it for most certain by Faith, without the least doubting, that his Body and Blood are given thee. And now the Interpreter: This only means, that we must not look upon it after Consecration, as Common Bread, but as Blessed Bread. And then tells his Reader, that St. Cyril says as great things of the Chrism-Oyl for Confirmation. I wonder he did not produce those Sayings. Do's he say that That Oyl is chang'd into the Body and Blood of Christ, and expound it by the Water that was chang'd into Wine at Cana? He affirms indeed, that the Chrism-Oyl is the Gift of Christ, but not that it is the Body of Christ, as he says of the Bread. St. Gregory Nyssen says, that That Body of Christ, which by God's appointment suffer'd Death, is receiv'd within our Body, and changes the whole to its own Likeness. And that That Immortal Body being within him that receives it, converts the Whole into its own Nature. And then considers, how 'tis possible, that one Body, which is always distributed to so many thousand Christians, should still remain Whole in it self. This the Interpreter delivers as directly contrary to our purpose: For tho' this Holy Father makes the Reception of the Body and Blood of Christ into our Stomach, necessary for the Curing our Bodies, and making them Immortal: Yet says the Answerer, (p. 69.) This Nourishing of our Bodies in a strict and proper Sense, cannot without Blasphemy be attributed to the Natural Body and Blood of Christ. But by the Answerer's leave, what need of Nourishing here in a Strict and Proper Sense? All the Nourishing that is here spoke of, is only for the making our Bodies Immortal; and to this I hope there's no necessity of its Nourishing in a Strict and Proper, but in a larger Sense, inasmuch as they receive from the Body of Christ, a Vertue in order to a Glorious Resurrection and Immortality in the next Life. And such a Nourishment as this
may

may be attributed, I hope, to that *Consecrated Food*, without any *Blasphemy* at all.

The same St. Gregory in another Testimony thus declares his Faith of this Mystery : *I do now rightly Believe, that the Bread Sanctifi'd by the Word of God, is chang'd into the Body of God the Word, Not so, that by being eaten, it becomes the Body of the Word; but because it is suddenly chang'd by the Word into his Body. And this is effected by the Vertue of Benediction; by which the Nature of those things which appear, is transelemented into it.* Here the Interpreter is at a stand; and tho' there be no less than thrice mention of the Bread being *Chang'd*, *Converted*, *Transelemented* into the *Body of Christ*, yet he says not one word to it; but only that the Testimony *is made up of Scraps*, and so he will not trouble himself with it, but desires that the Answer to the Former may serve for this too; tho' in reality it suits to neither, unless it be in his way of Answering, which is saying nothing.

A Third Testimony there is of this Father, wherein he affirms, *That the Bread in the beginning is only Common Bread; but when it is Sanctifi'd, it is call'd, and made the Body of Christ.* Here the Interpreter strikes in again with his *It means* : It means no change of *Substance*; but only of *Use*, *Quality*, and *Virtue*. As if to have a *Virtue* from *Christ*, were the same thing as to be *made the Body of Christ*, to be *Converted* or *Chang'd* into it. The *Water* of *Baptism* has a *Virtue* of *Christ*, so the *Oyl* of *Confirmation*; as the *Answerer* notes from this Father; yet no where do's this Holy Father say of that *Water* or *Oyl*, as he do's of the *Bread*, that they are *Made the Body of Christ*, or *Chang'd into it*. So that tho' no Man of Sense will think so of the *Baptismal Water* and *Oyl*, yet of the *Sacramental Bread* every true Believer must; since *Christ* and the Holy Fathers do so directly affirm it of the *Bread*, but not of the *Water* and *Oyl*, which,

which, tho' they are said to be the *Gift of Christ*, yet not to be *Made or Chang'd* into the *Body of Christ*.

St. Optatus Milevitanus calls the *Altar*, the *Seat of Christ's Body and Blood*; and the *Chalices*, the *Bearers of Christ's Blood*. St. Gaudentius declares, That God, who produces Bread out of the Earth, do's again of Bread make his own Body; and he who made Wine of Water, makes of Wine his own Blood. But this is nothing with the *Answerer*, and he gives a great Reason for it; because Gaudentius, in the words following, calls it *Consecrated Bread*; and therefore says the *Answerer*, 'Tis Bread still. He might as well say that *Man* is no *Man*, but *Dust* still; because he's said to be *Dust* in Scripture. *Dust thou art*. Which is no Consequence at all.

The next Testimonies are of St. Chrysostom, who speaking of the *Eucharist*, says, *Let us in all things believe God, and not contradict him, altho' what he says, seems contrary to our Apprehension and Eyes: For his Words cannot deceive, but our Sense may be easily mistaken. Those never err, but our Sense is very often deceiv'd. He that wrought those things at the Last Supper, is the Author of what is done here. We hold but the Place of Ministers; but he that Sanctifies and Changes them, is Christ himself. That which is in the Chalice, is the same that flow'd from his Side, and we are partakers of it. This Body was pierc'd with Nails, &c. This Body he hath given us both to possess and eat. This Body lying in a Manger, the Wise-Men Ador'd. This Table is in place of the Manger; for on this table lies the Body of our Lord.* Thus this Holy Father in plain and express terms, asserts the Doctrine of the Catholic Church concerning the *Eucharist*. And now what says our *Interpreter* the *Answerer* to them? He e'en throws them by for very vain or very much forced: and treating the Father very familiarly, he thinks that St. Chrysostom did not believe himself, especially in a literal Sense: and because he

he finds several *Rhetorical Expressions* in *these Homilies* of this *Father*, therefore he casts all by, tho' never so plain, as the warmth of his fruitful Fancy, heights of Eloquence, and extravagant Expressions, apter to excite a horror of the thing, than the love of Christ in our Hearts. An admirable Precedent for *Atheists*, to put them upon contemning, not only the Holy *Fathers*, but the *Scriptures* too, because in them there are several *Hyperboles* and *Rhetorical Expressions*! But I think, for defeating this Pretence of the *Answerer*, 'tis sufficient, that *St. Chrysostom* says no more here, than the rest of the Holy *Fathers* upon this Subject, and that he repeats the same Doctrin in his other Books, wherein he is not suppos'd to have indulg'd to the warmth of Eloquence; (as *Lib. de Sacerd.*) O Miracle! He that sits above with his Father, at the very same instant of Time is here in the Hands of all, He gives himself to those, who are willing to receive him. But all this prevails nothing with the *Answerer*; one Sentence in his Epistle to *Casarius* is sufficient with him to baffle all these larger and so often repeated Testimonies. And this is all the Remedy he has left; for if undervaluing the *Father*, when he appears against him, will not serve turn; then a doubtful and obscure Passage, brought by way of Similitude, must evacuate all the other plain and positive Testimonies of the same *Father*.

St. Ambrose is put off in the like nature: for tho' he affirms the *Sacrament* to be the *Flesh of Christ*, and *Blood*, and the *Body of the Giver*; and by consequence more noble than the *Manna*, which was only a *Shadow* or *Figure* of this Truth. The *Answerer* pretends (p. 71.) that there's only a Comparison betwixt our *Sacrament* and the Jews *Manna*, and that *St. Ambrose* prefers the First. Here's another Only very remarkable, an ordinary Eye will see more in this Testimony, than the bare Comparison, either plainly asserted or suppos'd, enough to set this Only with the Former, above mention'd.

Another

Another Testimony there is of this *Father*, wherein he proves the *Eucharist* to be the Body of Christ. That it is not what *Nature* fram'd, but what *Benediction* has Consecrated, which is of such *Efficacy*, as to change *Nature* it self. And having produc'd numerous Examples of many *Real Changes* wrought by holy Men, as of the *Rod* into a *Serpent*, the *Rivers* into *Blood*, he thus concludes; Now if *Blessings* given by Men were of so great *Efficacy*, as to change the *Nature* of things, what shall we say of the *Divine Consecration*, where the *Words of Christ* are *Operative*? For this *Sacrament*, which thou receivest, is made by the *Words of Christ*. And if the *Words of Elias* were so powerful, as to draw *Fire* from *Heaven*, shall not the *Words of Christ* be powerful enough to change the *Nature of things*? Thou hast read of the *Creation of the World*, that God spoke, and the things were made; He commanded, and they receiv'd a *Being*. If therefore *Christ* by his *Word* was Able to make *Something of Nothing*, shall he not be thought Able to change *One thing into another*? For 'tis no less a *Work* to give a *Nature and Being* to things, than to change them from *One Nature to Another*. Here's mention so often of a *Conversion* or *Change*, and this not of any *Virtue* or *Quality*, but the very *Nature* it self, that 'tis almost impossible to elude the force of the Testimony, whilst the *Holy Father* from the *Power of Creation*, proves in God the *Power of Conversion*; since He that gives a *Being* or *Nature* to things, can with less difficulty change things from one *Nature* to another. And yet the *Answerer*, contrary to the apparent Design of the *Father*, will have this *Change* here spoken of, to import no more than of the *Quality* or *Use* of things. And he gives his *Word* for't, with the pretended *Authority* of the *Father*; but without any word of the *Father* in it to this purpose, but only by the help of his *Comment* upon the *Text*. And the Case is plain from the *Answerer's* own *Argument* above, (p. 70.) There he'll have the *Change* in the Sacra-

mental Bread to be only in its *Quality* or *Use*, because 'tis brought as an Instance of the *Change* of the *Baptismal Water*, which is only in *Quality* or *Virtue*. And ought not the *Change* in the *Eucharist* upon the same Argument, be there judg'd to be even in the very *Nature* and *Being* of the Thing; since St. *Ambrose*, in this place, to prove this *Change* in the *Eucharist*, instances in so many *Real Conversions*, where there is not only a bare *Change* in *Use* and *Quality*, but even of One *Nature* or *Being* into Another: Otherwise those Instances would be very improper, and not all agreeable to the Design of the *Father*.

Several other Testimonies there are of this and other *Fathers* upon this Subject, in which they assert, That the *Eucharist* is the *True Flesh* of *Christ* which we receive. *Ambr.* That *He is upon the Altar, who Suffer'd for the Redemption of all.* *Id.* That it is the *Body* of our Lord and Saviour, and his *Blood*, which was shed for the Remission of Sins. *Hier.* That *Christ* *Convers'd with us in Flesh* and gives us that very *Flesh* to eat. *Aug.* That with our Heart and Mouth we receive our Mediator *Christ Jesus.* *Id.* That the *Holy Ghost* makes the *Common Bread* become the *Proper Body* of *Him* that was *Incar-nate.* *Isid. Pel.* That it is really his *Proper Flesh*, who for our sakes became *Man.* *Cyr. Alex.* That what is propos'd upon the *holy Tables*, is the *Proper Body* of the *Word* begotten of the *Father.* *Id.* That we receive within us both *Corporally* and *Spiritually*, *Him* who is truly the *Son of God.* *Id.* He that was *Typically* eaten in *Egypt*, here voluntarily *Sacrifices himself*; and the *Figure* being eaten, He, as the *Fulfiller* of the *Figure*, shews forth the *Truth*, proposing himself the *Food of Life.* *Id.* That by the *Holy Ghost* the *Bread* and *Wine* are chang'd into the very *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ.* *Procl. C.* That the *Faithful* ought to receive at the *holy Table*, not at all doubting of the truth of *Christ's Body* and *Blood.* *Leo. M.* That the *Invisible Priest*, by a *bidden Power*, converts the *Visible Creatures* into the *Sub-
stance*

stance of his own Body and Blood. Nor let any one question the possibility of the Elements being Converted by the Command of Power, into the Nature of Christ's Body. When the Creatures are plac'd upon the Holy Altars, to be Bless'd with Heavenly Words, their Substance is then Bread and Wine; but after the Words of Christ, 'tis the Body and Blood of Christ. And what wonder, that those things which he Created by his Word, he can after Creation change into other things, and convert into something better? Auct, Ho. 5. That by an unexpressible Power he converts the Bread and Wine into the Substance of his own Body. Id.

These and many other such Assertions of the *Fathers* are found in *Nubes Testium* upon this Subject of the *Eucharist*, which tho' they are so Plain and Express, that nothing can be more; yet the *Answerer* contents himself, either with saying nothing to them, because he apprehends 'twould be *Troublesom* to himself, and *Tedious* to his Reader; or else puts them by with saying, They are to be understood in a *Figurative Sense*. A Method very Proper for the ending all Controversie: For whilst the *Appeal* is made to the *Fathers*, for the deciding Points Controverted, and every one thinks it Just, to Interpret them in the Sense they please, there's no question but every one will have the *Fathers* on their side, and there's no body but who will be in the Right. Let any one produce the clearest Testimonies of the *Fathers*, wherein they deliver their Sentiments never so Large and Plain; 'Tis but for another to come and say, All this is but a *Rhetorical Flight*, the *Warmth of their Fruitful Fancy*: They are nothing but so many *Hyperboles*: some *Towering* and *Extravagant Expressions*, and are to be Expounded in a *Figurative Sense*; and this presently turns the Scale, and the *Fathers* are by this made to favor what before they seem'd plainly to *Contradiet*.

But what better can be expected towards the *Fathers*,
F 2 when

when even the *Scripture* it self is thus handled? Every one Interprets the *Sacred Text* their own way, and so all are in the *Right*, whilst they all Judge for themselves : And by this means, the *same Bible* that serves for *Lutheranism* to the *Lutheran*, serves for *Calvinism* to the *Calvinist*, for *Socinianism* to the *Socinian*, for *Arianism* to the *Arian*, for *Quakerism* to the *Quaker* : And the same serves the *Church-of-England man* for his Faith as *Establisht by Law* ; whilst they All reading the *same*, and All thrusting in their *Figuratively*, their *Morally*, their *Rhetorically*, their *Properly*, their *I think it means*, &c. Where they judge fit : they make it speak every one to their own mind, and render it as different from it self, as they do the *Primitive Fathers*. So that as to appeal to the *Scripture*, whilst every one Interprets it as he pleases, can end no Controversie ; so to appeal to the *Fathers* for the *Sense* of the *Scripture*, can have as little Effect, whilst These too, by this presumptuous Humor of Interpreting, are made liable to the same differing Sense of every Reader.

'Twas this Method of Undervaluing the Judgment of the *Church*, and then every Man setting up his own in the stead, that has all along disturb'd the Peace of Christendom : 'Twas upon this Ground the *Pretended Reformation* came into the World, when every *Disgusted* or *Conceited* Divine took upon them what they would not allow even to *Whole Assemblies* or *General Councils* of their Predecessors ; When they cry'd out to their Hearers, You must not *Trust* to the *Judgment* of *Past Councils*, nor *Rely* upon their *Decisions* or *Sentiments* : But you may safely *Rely* upon *Us*. *They Err'd*, but *We'll Guide You* into all *Truth* : And if you dare not *Rely* upon us, yet *Trust* to your own *Private Judgment of Discretion* ; This will lead you without Erring, through all those Paths, in which *Whole Assemblies* of your Forefathers have *Err'd*, and gone astray

astray for many Generations. 'Twas this Principle put every *Private Doctor* upon setting up for *Reformers*, and gave Authority to every *Member* of a Congregation to be a *Church* to themselves; whilst to *Guide* now became every Man's Province, who had but Confidence enough to condemn the Holy *Fathers*, and pity the *Ignorance* of all besides themselves. 'Twas at this Time the only Cry was, *The Scriptures, The Scriptures; We must follow none but the Word of God*: And yet every Man of these beat up for several Ways, as if the *Scriptures* had been as different as the Brains of the disagreeing *Interpreters*. *Luther*, notwithstanding his opening the Gate to all this Disorder, could not but observe, and even expose this destructive Imposture; and because it may be as proper for the *Interpreters* of *Fathers*, as of *Scripture*, I'll here set down what he has remark'd upon this Point, but particularly relating to *Zuinglius* and *Oecolampadius*, in their Interpretation of these Words, *This is my Body* in the Institution of the *Eucharist*, as being contrary to his Doctrin of the *Real Presence*.

Come, (says he) Let us hear in what manner they take away our Sense from the Words of Christ, and thrust in their own: They say, that this word *Is* imports the same as *It signifies*, as *Zuinglius* will have it. And these words *My Body*, to be the same as the *Sign of my Body*, as *Oecolampadius* Interprets it. The meaning therefore of Christ's Words, according to *Zuinglius*, is this; *Take, Eat, This signifies my Body*: and according to *Oecolampadius's* Text; *Take, Eat, This is a Sign of my Body*. And they are as certain, that this is the *True Meaning* of the Words, and stand as firmly in it, as a Reed shaken with the Wind, &c. And truly, they speak very big and gravely upon the Matter: But 'tis just the same as if I should fall into the Opinion of *Aristotle* and *Plato*, concerning the *Eternity of the World*, and deny, That God Created the Heaven and the Earth; and some one, to Confute me, should produce those Words of *Genesis*, Ch. 1. *In the beginning God Created the Heaven and the Earth*; and I, on the other hand, to Reply to my Adversary, should thus expound

pound those Words of *Moses*; *God*, that is, *the Cuckow*; *Created*, that is, *Devour'd*; *the Heaven and the Earth*, that is, *a whole Titling, Bones and Feathers and all*: So that the meaning of those Words of *Genesis* should make to be thus; *In the beginning the Cuckow devour'd the Titling, Bones and Feathers and all*, quite casting by that other, *In the beginning God Created the Heaven and the Earth*. Would not this be an admirable piece of Skill, and well becoming the Stage? 'Twould be much the same again, if I should deny that *God the Son was made Man*, and that Text of *S. John*, Ch. 1. *The Word was made Flesh*, I should expound thus, *The Word* signifies a *Crooked Stick*, and *Flesh* signifies a *Kite*; and the whole meaning is thus, *A Crooked Stick was made a Kite*. And if my Conscience should upon this prove uneasy, and cry out, *Mr. Martin*, you put a *Force* upon the *Text*, and expound it very awkwardly, *But*, &c. And I should keep in that *B U T* till my Cheeks were colour'd with Shame, and yet should say, Ah false Traitor, away with that *B U T*, and be silent, lest your wicked Conscience be discover'd. And after this triumphing with my Hands and Mouth, I should boastfully cry out, Alas, the Christians have not so much as *one Text* in Scripture, to prove, that the *Word of God was made Flesh*. But then should pretendedly submit my self to be Instructed, how this could be prov'd from Scripture, which I had before so crossly expounded. If this were Just and Lawful for me to do, O God, how much Trouble and Confusion could I give both to *Jews* and *Christians*, from the Old and New Testament! *Lib. Defens. Verb. cœn.*

In this manner do's *Luther* expose this Extravagant Method of his *Fellow Reformers*, and their disturbing the Peace of Christendom with their *Forc'd Interpretations*. And however it may agree with *Zuinglius* and *Oecolampadius*, yet I am confident it suits as well with our present Adversaries, who know as well to bring the *Scriptures* and *Fathers* to their purpose, by their *It means*, and *It signifies*, as any of their Reforming Predecessors; and upon occasion can tell how to make a *Cuckow*, a *Titling* or *Crooked Stick* of any thing in good Earnest, as ever *Luther* did in Jest. This an ordinary Reader may observe in the perusal of

of *this*, and other such *Answers*, which at this time appear abroad against *Nubes Testium*, &c. in which, tho' a great part of the *Testimonies* produc'd, are such, as even are acknowledg'd to favor *Papery* by *Luther*, the *Centuriators*, *Cartwright*, *Whitgift*, *Fulk*, *Osiander*, *Whitaker*, and the other great Lights of the *Reformation*, who upon this very score condemn or reprove the *Fathers*, whose *Testimonies* they are: Yet now by this newly reviv'd way of *Interpreting*, our Modern Doctors, who know the true Use of *It means*, and *It signifies*, make all that in the *Fathers* to be *Good Protestancy*, which their Predecessors, poor mistaken Souls, took for *Papery*: But by what *Forc'd* and *Rack'd* Interpretations, the Impartial Reader may by this time have discover'd, who has taken the pains to consider upon these short *Reflections*, in which I have run through all the Sections of the *Answerer*, excepting the last, to wit, of *Images*; upon which Point having before publish'd a whole Discourse in defence of this Part of *Nubes Testium*, I desist from any farther Repetition here, and for Satisfaction thither remit the Reader. But I must not leave him without a *Postscript*, which is now so much in Fashion.

A P O S T S C R I P T.

THE last Week was Publish'd a *Second Defence* against the *Bishop of Condom*, with a *Postscript*, pretended as an *Answer* to the *Third Part of the Papist Misrepresented*, &c. wherein the *Representer* is Character'd for one, that scarce knows how to write *Sense* in his *Answers*, and has as little *Manners* as *Sense*. The *Representer* cannot but give the *Defender* Thanks for his *Complement*: But fearing, if he should do it in his own Words, it might not have so *Good Sense*, nor so much *Manners* in it, as becomes the *Defender*, who is to be suppos'd to speak nothing but *Truth*; he desires to know what Authors he'll recommend to him to peruse, so to prepare him for *Answering* for the future, and making his Address of Thanks, that

that they may be sure to want neither *Good Sense* nor *Good Manners*. Shall he in his *Answers* for the future, to be sure to have *Good Sense* in them, follow the Method of the *Defender*, who to this *Postscript* of his, puts the Title of *A Full Answer to the Third Part*, when it has not *one word* in it of the *Third Part*, but only a Flirt at the *Preface*? And for *Good Manners*, shall he instead of *Posture-masters*, &c. which the *Defender* reproves, put *Merry-Andrews*, a Term of Art which he himself uses in the same *Postscript*? Or shall he go for better Manners to him, who makes a Parallel betwixt a *Mystery of Faith* and a *Black Dog*? *Reply to the Answ. of the Confer.* Or to another, who can tell how to Complement the greatest *Prelate* in the World, with the Title of *As great a Dissembler as ever liv'd*? *State of Ch. of R. at the Reform. Pref.* Or to another, who speaking of his Popish Adversaries, thus concludes his Book: *There is a Generation of Men in the World, Who adding a Profound Ignorance to a False Zeal, fear not to sacrifice all the Considerations of Shame and Honesty, of Truth and Reason, to a present Interest, and the poor Advantage of a short-liv'd Imposture. Specul. Eccles. Consider'd.* Or, not to go farther, shall he follow his present Adversary, who comes so thick with his *Ridiculously, Little Brains, No Honesty, Childish Stuff*, &c. *Veteres Vindic.* If the *Defender* thinks there's more *Sense*, and better *Manners* in these, he would do well to inform the *Representor*; 'tis likely he's so good natur'd, to do the best he can to please him in his next. Tho' I am apt to believe, this would not pass currant from a *Papist* to a *Protestant*, either for very good *Sense* or *Manners*. It do's all well enough, I know, against the *Papists*; there's nothing like it, for one that has a mind to be *Popular*; and especially, when a Man desires to be so Qualifi'd, as to gain the *Peoples Votes* for a little *Preferment*. But for my part, I think I had better keep as I am, than follow such Copies: I have perus'd them so long already, that I fear I am the *Worse* for't. If my *Dialect* be alter'd from what it was in the beginning, 'tis by *Conversing* too much with my *Adversaries*, who have brought Controversie into that Strain, that whatsoever Improvement a Reader may expect from them, I am sure it must not be in *Good Manners*.

F I N I S.